Tomographically reconstructed master equations for any open quantum dynamics

Felix A. Pollock* and Kavan Modi†
School of Physics & Astronomy, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia
(Dated: April 21, 2017)

Memory effects in open quantum dynamics are often incorporated in a system's equation of motion through a superoperator known as the memory kernel. Knowledge of this superoperator allows for the exact prediction of the system's evolution. However, the usual prescription for determining the memory kernel requires information about the underlying system-environment dynamics. Here, we demonstrate a fundamental connection between dynamical maps that can be determined from the evolution of the system alone and a memory kernel master equation. In doing so, we derive transfer tensors for general open dynamics, leading to the possibility for experimental reconstruction of the memory kernel and efficient numerical simulation of driven systems with initial correlations.

arXiv:1704.06204v1 [quant-ph] 20 Apr 2017

A significant fraction of active research in physics and chemistry, both theoretical and experimental, involves characterising or modelling the dynamics of open quantum systems. Such dynamics is, in general, significantly more complicated than that dictated by Schrödinger's equation. Nevertheless, a plethora of techniques have been developed to predict how open systems will evolve in time. These include schemes for tomographically determining an unknown open process [1–4], perturbative approaches to theoretically modelling dynamics [5–7], and computationally expensive numerical techniques which can exactly simulate an open system under certain circumstances [8–11]. However, the resources required for the latter often scale exponentially with the evolution time, and numerical shortcuts usually rely on assumptions about the dynamics, such as no time-dependent driving [12] or limited memory effects [13], meaning long-time dynamical simulations are intractable for the most general open processes.

Conceptually, approaches to describing open quantum dynamics tend to take one of two perspectives, depicted in Fig. 1: First is the "dilated" picture, where the system in question (S) is represented as evolving with its environment (E) from an initial state $\rho_{t_0}^{SE}$, with a time evolution superoperator $\mathcal{U}_{t:t_0}^{SE}$ [14] that propagates solutions of an equation of the form

$$\dot{\rho}_t^{SE} = \mathcal{L}_t^{SE}\rho_t^{SE}. \tag{1}$$

All the physics of the system is encoded in the superoperator $\mathcal{L}_t^{SE}$, which is usually taken to evolve SE according to the von Neumann equation [15], but could also incorporate dissipative and decohering dynamics through (possibly time-dependent) Lindblad terms [16, 17].

The second picture is the operational one, where the entire dynamics is described in terms of quantities that would be, in principle, directly measurable by an experimenter with access to the system alone. In this picture, the dynamics may often be described in terms of a dynamical map $\Lambda_{t:t_0}$, which is completely positive and trace preserving, and evolves the initial system state ρ_{t_0} to its counterpart at time t: $\rho_t = \Lambda_{t:t_0}\rho_{t_0}$ [18]. This description is valid when the system and environment are initially uncorrelated in the other picture. More generally, the dynamics can be described in terms of a superchannel [2, 19] $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}$, which maps an initial preparation superoperator $\mathcal{A}$—any transformation that could be applied to the system at time t_0—to the state at later times: $\rho_t = \rho_{t,\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}[\mathcal{A}]$. The superchannel was introduced to operationally tackle dynamics with initial system-environment correlations. The time-evolved system state that one would obtain without performing any preparation procedure (the 'freely-evolved' state) is simply given by $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}[\mathcal{I}]$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is the identity superoperator. The dynamics, $\Lambda_{t:t_0}$ or $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}$, can be reconstructed operationally by means of quantum process tomography [1, 3, 20].

While these two pictures are equivalent, in the sense that any open quantum evolution can be represented in either way, it is not always clear how to convert from the operational to the dilated picture (though the reverse is usually straightforwardly achieved by tracing out over the environment, $\rho_t = \mathrm{tr}_E\rho_t^{SE}$). That is, there is no generally applicable technique which allows the underlying SE quantities, $\rho_{t_0}^{SE}$ and $\mathcal{L}_t^{SE}$, to be recovered from operationally reconstructible maps, such as $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}$. Where this is possible, even partially, the system can be used, for instance, as a probe of its environment [21–23]. Knowledge of the global dynamics, inferred from the evolution of the system, can also be used to more efficiently predict future dynamics. This is embodied in the transfer tensor method [12], where, in certain cases, short time system dynamics can be used to construct a discretized memory kernel, in the form of the eponymous transfer tensors, encoding SE memory effects. The transfer tensors can then be used to propagate the system to later times, simulating the long-time dynamics with exponentially fewer resources than many other methods [24]. Memory kernels are often used to formulate exact, continuous time open dynamics, most famously in the form of the Nakajima-Zwanzig master equation [5], discussed further below. However, unless the underlying dynamics is time-independent and the system is initially uncorrelated with its environment, there is no clear way to construct the memory kernel or transfer tensors operationally, either in experiment or in numerical simulations.

In this Letter, we solve this problem definitively. We demonstrate a direct correspondence between tomographically reconstructed dynamics and a general Nakajima-Zwanzig master equation, and extend the transfer tensor approach to, in principle, any open quantum dynamics, in particular those with initial correlations and time-dependent generators. Crucially, this renders a large class of difficult numer-



Figure 1. (Color online) **Two equivalent pictures of open quantum dynamics.** (a) The system, initially in joint state $\rho_{t_0}^{SE}$ with its environment, is prepared at time t_0 with operation $\mathcal{A}$. The two then evolve together according to $\dot{\rho}_t^{SE} = \mathcal{L}_t^{SE}\rho_t^{SE}$, leading to a final state ρ_t for the system that depends on the initial preparation. (b) The system state at time t can also be thought of as a function of the preparation operation at time t_0. All the uncontrollable parts of the process (enclosed within the dashed lines in the first picture), including the initial system-environment state, are encapsulated in the linear map $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}$. When $\rho_{t_0}^{SE}$ is uncorrelated, the dynamics can be equivalently thought of as a completely-positive trace-preserving map from the initial state of the system.

ical problems efficiently solvable. In addition, it opens up the possibility of deriving approximate master equations through operationally meaningful coarse-graining of the reduced dynamics. Before presenting our main results, we first introduce memory kernels and their relation to the underlying dynamics.

Memory kernel master equations—The most general form for the generator of a memoryless, or Markov, quantum evolution was famously derived by Lindblad [16], as well as Gorini, Kossakowski and Sudarshan [17], in the 1970s. In this case, the derivative of the system state at time t is proportional to the state at that same time, as in Eq. (1). For more general, non-Markovian processes, one natural way to extend the formalism is to consider master equations in which the time derivative depends on the history of the system's evolution:

$$\dot{\rho}_t = \mathcal{L}_t\rho_t + \int_{t_0}^{t} \mathrm{d}s\, \mathcal{K}_{t,s}\rho_s + \mathcal{J}_{t,t_0}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_t$ is a time-local generator, $\mathcal{K}_{t,s}$ is a superoperator known as the memory kernel, and $\mathcal{J}_{t,t_0}$ is an inhomogeneous term, that can depend on the initial condition. Put simply, the memory kernel $\mathcal{K}_{t,s}$ quantifies how the system state at time s influences, through interaction with the environment, the evolution at later time t. Knowledge of the functions on the right hand side of Eq. (2) allow for the self-consistent solution of the system's dynamics.

Though several phenomenological forms for master equations with memory kernels have been proposed [25–29], it is also possible, given a microscopic description, to cast any open dynamics in the form of Eq. 3 using the Nakajima-Zwanzig projection superoperator technique [5]. In this technique, a superoperator $\mathcal{P}^{SE}$ and its complement $\mathcal{Q}^{SE} = \mathcal{I}^{SE} - \mathcal{P}^{SE}$ are defined on the joint SE space, such that $\mathcal{P}^{SE}\rho_t^{SE} = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\rho_t^{SE}\} \otimes \tau^E$. That is, $\mathcal{P}^{SE}$ projects any state onto a product of the reduced system state and some fixed state τ^E of the environment. The latter can be arbitrarily chosen, though certain choices will often simplify the form of the resulting Nakajima-Zwanzig equation. Moreover, the projection superoperators can also be made to be time dependent [30, 31], such that $\mathcal{P}_t^{SE}\rho_t^{SE} = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\rho_t^{SE}\} \otimes \tau_t^E$, where τ_t^E is not necessarily related to the actual reduced state of the environment. The time-local generator, memory kernel and inhomogeneous term can in this case be expressed in terms of these operators as

$$\mathcal{L}_t\rho_t = \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{P}_t^{SE}\mathcal{L}_t^{SE}\mathcal{P}_t^{SE}\rho_t^{SE}\right\}, \quad \mathcal{K}_{t,t'}\rho_{t'} = \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{P}_t^{SE}\mathcal{L}_t^{SE}T_{\leftarrow}\exp\left(\int_{t'}^{t}\mathrm{d}s\,\mathcal{Q}_s^{SE}\mathcal{L}_s^{SE}\right)\mathcal{Q}_{t'}^{SE}\mathcal{L}_{t'}^{SE}\mathcal{P}_{t'}^{SE}\rho_{t'}^{SE}\right\} \tag{3}$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_{t,t_0} = \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{P}_t^{SE}\mathcal{L}_t^{SE}T_{\leftarrow}\exp\left[\int_{t_0}^{t}\mathrm{d}s\,\mathcal{Q}_s^{SE}\mathcal{L}_s^{SE}\right]\mathcal{Q}_{t_0}^{SE}\mathcal{A}\rho_{t_0}^{SE}\right\}. \tag{4}$$

Importantly, different choices of projector lead to different forms for the memory kernel and inhomogeneous term, as exemplified in Fig. 2 and discussed further towards the end of this Letter.

We will now show how operationally determined quantities can be used to construct Nakajima-Zwanzig equations for general open processes.

Explicit derivation of transfer tensors—As mentioned above, the transfer tensor method developed in Ref. [12] can, under certain conditions, be used to relate the memory kernel to a family of dynamical maps $\Lambda_{t:t_0}$ which evolve the system from the initial time t_0 to some later time t. The original formulation is limited to cases which satisfy the following assumptions: (i) the underlying dynamics is time homogeneous, i.e., $\mathcal{L}_t^{SE} = \mathcal{L}^{SE}$; (ii) the initial SE state is uncorrelated: $\rho_{t_0}^{SE} = \rho_{t_0} \otimes \rho_{t_0}^E$; (iii) $\rho_{t_0}^E$ is a stationary state. When these conditions are not satisfied, $\Lambda_{t:t_0}$ (or $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}$ if (ii) does not hold, and the initial state is correlated) is not enough to determine $\mathcal{K}_{t,s}$ [32]. In general, additional information is required about the *intermediate dynamics*.

We now present our main result, an operational prescription for constructing useful transfer tensors from a general

open evolution. We begin by emulating the structure of the Nakajima-Zwanzig superoperators with a set of objects $\{\mathbf{P}_s, \mathbf{Q}_s\}$ which act as

$$\mathbf{P}_s\rho_t = \Lambda_{t:s}\rho_s, \quad \mathbf{Q}_s\rho_t = \rho_t - \Lambda_{t:s}\rho_s; \tag{5}$$

such that $(\mathbf{P}_s + \mathbf{Q}_s)\rho_t = \rho_t$. Subsequent action of these objects further break up the evolution, i.e., $\mathbf{P}_{s'}\Lambda_{t:s} = \Lambda_{t:s'}\Lambda_{s':s}$. Here, $\Lambda_{t:s}$ is a dynamical map from time s to time t, $\Lambda_{t:s}\rho = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{t:s}(\rho \otimes \rho^E_s)\}$. As discussed towards the end of this Letter, any mathematically reasonable dynamical map could be used here. However, a physically meaningful choice can be operationally obtained by allowing the system to evolve to some intermediate time s before measuring and re-preparing it and measuring it again at time t. That is, the dynamical map $\Lambda_{t:s}$ describes the dynamics from s to t which would occur if the SE correlations vanished at s, and it can be reconstructed using usual quantum process tomography.

Next, iterating the identity $(\mathbf{P}_s + \mathbf{Q}_s) = \mathcal{I}$, we can write the evolution up to time $t = t_N$ in terms of the evolution to $N-1$ earlier times $\{t_j\}$

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_t = &\left(\mathbf{P}_{t_{N-1}} + \mathbf{Q}_{t_{N-1}}\left(\mathbf{P}_{t_{N-2}} + \mathbf{Q}_{t_{N-2}}\right.\right. \\ &\left.\left.\times\left(\ldots\left(\mathbf{P}_{t_1} + \mathbf{Q}_{t_1}\left(\mathbf{P}_{t_0} + \mathbf{Q}_{t_0}\right)\ldots\right)\right)\right)\rho_t \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

$$= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j}\rho_{t_j} + \Xi_{t:t_0}. \tag{7}$$

where $T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j}\rho_{t_j} = \mathbf{Q}_{t_{N-1}}\cdots\mathbf{Q}_{t_{j+1}}\mathbf{P}_{t_j}\rho_t$ and $\Xi_{t:t_0} = \mathbf{Q}_{t_{N-1}}\cdots\mathbf{Q}_{t_0}\rho_t$.

Here, the $T^{(n)}_{t,s}$ are exactly the transfer tensors defined in Ref. [12], except that we are able to explicitly derive them in terms of operationally accessible maps, without appealing to time-homogeneity of the memory kernel. They are given by

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(1)}_{t:t_{N-1}} &= \Lambda_{t:t_{N-1}} \quad \text{and} \\ T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j} &= \Lambda_{t:t_j} - \sum_{k=j+1}^{N} T^{(N-k)}_{t:t_k}\Lambda_{t_k:t_j}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Chasing this definition leads to the explicit form $T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j} = \Lambda_{t:t_j} - \sum_k \Lambda_{t:t_k}\Lambda_{t_k:t_j} + \sum_k\sum_{l<k}\Lambda_{t:t_k}\Lambda_{t_k:t_l}\Lambda_{t_l:t_j} - \ldots$. Finally, the remaining inhomogeneous term in Eq. (7) encodes all memory effects arising from the initially correlated SE state, and is defined as the difference $\Xi_{t:t_0} = \rho_t - \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j}\rho_{t_j}$; this can be operationally determined for any initial preparation by reconstructing the superchannel $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}$, though we show towards the end of the article how the direct determination of this term can be avoided.

Operational memory kernels— We are now in a position to derive a master equation that relates the operationally determined transfer tensors to the underlying SE dynamics. To do this, we will construct a difference equation for the state at time t, before taking a limit and recovering a derivative at that time. We first divide the interval $[t_0, t]$ into N parts, as above, and choose the $N+1$ times $\{t_k\}$ to each be δt apart:



Figure 2. (Color online) **Elements of different memory kernels for the same process.** Derived from exact simulation of a two qubit SE in initial state $\rho^{SE}_{t_0} = \frac{3}{4}|0+\rangle\langle 0+| + \frac{1}{4}|1-\rangle\langle 1-|$, where $|\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)$, with $H^{SE}_t = \frac{\omega}{2}\sigma^S_z + \frac{\omega}{2}\sigma^E_z + g(\sigma^S_x\sigma^E_x + \cos(\Omega t)\sigma^S_y\sigma^E_y)$ and stochastic excitation of the environment (Lindblad operator $L = |0\rangle\langle 1|$) with rate Γ_0; relative size of parameters given by $\omega = \Gamma_0 = g/2 = 5\Omega$. (a) Three different choices of $\mathcal{P}^{SE}_t$ and hence memory kernel: (i) the usual case of projection onto initial environment state, $\mathcal{P}^{SE}\rho^{SE}_t = \rho_t \otimes \mathrm{tr}_S\{\rho^{SE}_{t_0}\}$ (blue, solid); (ii) projection arising from keeping the system in fixed state $|0\rangle\langle 0|$, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_t = \mathcal{B}_{|0\rangle\langle 0|}$ (red, dot-dashed); (iii) projection onto true environment state, $\mathcal{P}^{SE}_t\rho^{SE}_t = \rho_t \otimes \mathrm{tr}_S\{\rho^{SE}_t\}$, corresponding to $\mathcal{E}_t = \mathcal{I}$ (green, dashed). (b) Corresponding elements of the transfer tensor approximating the memory kernel in case (ii), normalised by the time-increment $\delta t = (t - t_0)/N$, for different numbers of intermediate steps N (listed in the figure).

$t_{j+1} - t_j = \delta t := (t - t_0)/N$ [33]. By substituting Eq. (7) into the difference between $\rho_t = \rho_{t_N}$ and $\rho_{t_{N-1}}$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\rho_t - \rho_{t_{N-1}}}{\delta t} =& \frac{(\Lambda_{t:t_{N-1}} - \mathcal{I})}{\delta t}\rho_{t_{N-1}} \\ &+ \sum_{j=0}^{N-2}\delta t\,\frac{T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j}}{\delta t^2}\rho_{t_j} + \frac{\Xi_{t:t_0}}{\delta t}, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

which resembles, term by term, a discrete version of the Nakajima-Zwanzig master equation given in Eq. (2). We now show that in the limit $N \to \infty$ the two are the same.

To make the connection between Eqs. (2) and (9) explicit, we rewrite the maps $\Lambda_{t:s}$ in terms of $\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{t:s}$; in this way, the decomposition in Eq. (6) can be recast as

$$\mathbf{P}_s\rho_t = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{t:s}\mathcal{P}^{SE}_s\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{t:t_0}\mathcal{A}\rho^{SE}_{t_0}\} \quad \text{and} \tag{10}$$

$$\mathbf{Q}_s\rho_t = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{t:s}\mathcal{Q}^{SE}_s\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{t:t_0}\mathcal{A}\rho^{SE}_{t_0}\} \tag{11}$$

where the projection superoperators $\mathcal{P}^{SE}_s$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{SE}_s$ are exactly

of the kind appearing in Eqs. (3) & (4) for the Nakajima-Zwanzig memory kernel and inhomogeneous term. Specifically, they project onto the environment states $\rho^E_{t_j}$ that correspond to the reconstructed intermediate dynamical maps $\Lambda_{t:t_j}$. This means that the transfer tensors and $\Xi_{t:t_0}$ can also be written in terms of SE quantities. Then, using the fact that $\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{t+\delta t:t} \simeq \mathcal{I}^{SE} + \delta t \mathcal{L}^{SE}_t + \delta t^2 {\mathcal{L}^{SE}_t}^2 + \dots$ for small δt, the limit $N \to \infty$ can be taken in Eq. (9). We perform this calculation in detail in the Supplemental Information, finding that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j} = \delta t^2 \mathcal{K}_{t,t_j} \text{ and } \lim_{N\to\infty} \Xi_{t:t_0} = \delta t \mathcal{J}_{t,t_0}, \quad (12)$$

leading exactly to the Nakajima-Zwanzig equation in Eq. (2) (the time-local part arises straightforwardly from the first term in Eq. (9)). What this means is that, even for time-inhomogeneous SE dynamics and initial correlations, the memory kernel can be operationally determined by reconstructing the short time-difference dynamics starting from a series of intermediate time points. In Fig. 2, we illustrate this fact with a numerical simulation.

We have now shown how operationally accessible maps can be quantitatively related to a memory kernel and inhomogeneous term that depend explicitly on the underlying SE dynamics. However, as we earlier remarked, our derivation goes through with any reasonable family of dynamical maps $\Lambda_{t:s}$ (or equivalently projectors $\mathcal{P}^{SE}_t$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{SE}_t$), though some choices are more convenient than others. Next, we discuss the operational meaning of this choice and devise a way to ensure that the dynamics are reconstructed in a way that is also numerically tractable.

Simplifying the intermediate dynamics—Suppose the joint SE evolution were left unperturbed before reconstructing $\Lambda_{t:s}$, then the state of the environment at time s would be the freely evolved reduced state: $\rho^E_s = \mathrm{tr}_S\{\mathcal{U}^{SE}_{s:t_0}\rho^{SE}_{t_0}\}$. While this is perfectly reasonable from an operational standpoint, it is somewhat limiting from the perspective of simulating the dynamics or extracting information about $\mathcal{L}^{SE}_t$ from the memory kernel; the time-dependent state of the environment is (usually) at least as difficult to solve for as ρ_t. Alternatively, we could, in general, choose to act on the system with a series of superoperators $\vec{\mathcal{E}} = \{\mathcal{E}_{t_k}\}$ between times t_0 and s, leading to different environment states $\rho^E_{s,\vec{\mathcal{E}}}$ and, correspondingly, different families of intermediate dynamical maps $\Lambda_{t:s}$ (where we have left the $\vec{\mathcal{E}}$ dependence implicit for notational convenience). This procedure is depicted in Fig. 3.

A particularly useful choice is the one where entanglement-breaking operations $\mathcal{E}_{t_j}\rho = \mathcal{B}_{\sigma_{t_j}}\rho = \sigma_{t_j}$ are applied at times $t_j < s$, where σ_{t_j} is some fixed state for each time step. In this case, the evolution of $\rho^E_{t_j,\vec{\mathcal{E}}}$ effectively decouples from the system in the limit that these operations are applied infinitely quickly. That is, the reduced state of the environment evolves according to $\dot{\rho}^E_t = \mathrm{tr}_S\{\mathcal{L}^{SE}_t \sigma_t \otimes \rho^E_t\} = \mathcal{L}^E_t \rho^E_t$. If the overall evolution is unitary, then this just corresponds to evolution with the 'average' Hamiltonian $\bar{H}^E_t = \mathrm{tr}_S\{H^{SE}_t((\sigma_t \otimes \mathbb{1})\}$. In an experiment, this could be achieved by, for instance, dynamically decoupling the system [34] or using the quantum Zeno effect to freeze the dynamics through frequent strong measurement [35].



Figure 3. (Color online) **Reconstructing intermediate dynamics.** (a) After decorrelating the system from its environment (e.g., by projectively measuring and forgetting the outcome) at some intermediate time t_j, the subsequent dynamics is described by a CPTP map $\Lambda_{t:t_j}$. This can be operationally determined through normal quantum process tomography, i.e., by repreparing the system in various states ρ and determining the corresponding ρ' at later times. In general, operations $\vec{\mathcal{E}} = \{\mathcal{E}_{t_k}\}$ could be performed on the system at a series of earlier times $\{t_k < t_j\}$, leading to different $\Lambda_{t:t_j}$. (b) One choice of $\vec{\mathcal{E}}$ which leads to a self-consistently solvable reconstructed master equation is $\mathcal{E}_{t_k} = \mathcal{B}_{\sigma_k}$, where $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_k}\rho = \sigma_k$. That is, $\mathcal{B}_{\sigma_k}$ is an entanglement-breaking operation with a fixed output. (c) The map $\Lambda_{t:t_j}$ corresponds to joint evolution with an environment initially in state $\rho^E_{t_j,\vec{\mathcal{E}}}$, which depends on the history of applied operations.

For numerical simulations, this implies that intermediate dynamics can be calculated with an initial environment state that depends straightforwardly on the initial state (assuming the dynamics of the environment in isolation can be solved easily). In fact, in many cases, there will be choices of σ_t such that $\rho^E_{t_0}$ is a stationary state with respect to $\mathcal{L}^E_t$, leading to time-independent projectors $\mathcal{P}^{SE}$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{SE}$. It should be noted that the usual choice of time-independent projector can always be used to numerically construct the transfer tensors in Eq. (8), though in most cases the intermediate dynamical maps will lose their operational meaning.

When $\mathcal{L}^{SE}_s$ is periodic or transient, the ability to use time-independent projectors means that reconstruction would only need to be performed over a finite time window in order to determine the dynamics for *all* times [36], as long as the inhomogeneous term dies off sufficiently quickly. However, as we now show, calculating the latter can be avoided altogether at the expense of repeating the reconstruction for multiple choices of preparation $\mathcal{A}$.

Avoiding the inhomogeneous term—Many techniques for simulating open quantum systems, exactly or approximately, rely on a product assumption for the initial state: $\rho^{SE}_{t_0} = \rho_{t_0} \otimes \rho^E_{t_0}$. When this is not the case, there is always an inhomogeneous term in Eq. (2), and, while techniques have been developed to absorb it into the homogeneous part [37, 38], these rely on knowledge of the underlying dynamics. This makes the explicit calculation of $\rho_t = \mathcal{M}_{t,t_0}[\mathcal{A}]$, and hence $\Xi_{t:t_0}$, problematic for an initially

correlated SE, at least when the preparation $\mathcal{A}$ does not break those correlations.

However, when a preparation does break the correlations between system and environment, the subsequent dynamics can be simulated in the usual way (with the environment initially in state $\mathrm{tr}_S\{\mathcal{A}\rho_{t_0}^{SE}\}$). We now use the property that the superchannel is linear, and that any preparation operation can be written as a linear combination $\mathcal{A} = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha \mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)}$, where $\{\mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)}\}$ is a set of entanglement breaking completely-positive (but not necessarily trace-preserving) maps, and $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ [3]. This means that the time-evolved state for any preparation can be written as a linear combination of time-evolved states from some finite set of preparations where there are no initial correlations: $\rho_{t,\mathcal{A}} = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha \rho_{t,\mathcal{A}^{(\alpha)}}$.

In the dilated picture, this is equivalent to writing the initial SE state as $\rho_{t_0}^{SE} = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha X^{(\alpha)} \otimes \tau^{(\alpha)}$, where $\{X^{(\alpha)}\}$ is a set of d_S^2 linearly independent system operators. By solving for the dynamics with each of the d_S^2 uncorrelated initial environment states $\tau^{(\alpha)}$, the need to calculate the inhomogeneous term can be entirely circumvented.

Discussion—In this Letter, we have presented a scheme for relating an operationally meaningful description of any open quantum process, in terms of dynamical maps, to a Nakajima-Zwanzig equation that depends on the underlying system-environment dynamics. In addition to providing a fundamental connection between two different pictures of open dynamics, our result opens up the possibility for efficient simulation of the long-time evolution of driven systems or those with initial correlations.

Instead of directly solving the dynamics of a system to some long time t, dynamical maps can be reconstructed to a point where the memory kernel has decayed (from the end of the first driving period). These can then be used to calculate transfer tensors which will propagate the system to arbitrarily long times, with an error that depends on the density of time points used in the reconstruction.

Moreover, the freedom in choosing how the dynamical maps are reconstructed (or, equivalently, the freedom in choosing the underlying projection operator) may lead to memory kernels which decay faster than those appearing in the conventional Nakajima Zwanzig equation (as evidenced in panel (a) of Fig. 2). This means that the time over which the dynamics needs to be reconstructed could be further reduced with a judicious choice of $\vec{\mathcal{E}}$. We leave the investigation of this property for the future.

Using Eq. (9), an experimentally or numerically reconstructed set of transfer tensors could also be used to create an approximate memory kernel through interpolation or form fitting. The resulting master equation would be guaranteed to give mathematically sensible solutions. Since its accuracy would depend on the smoothness of the memory kernel rather than, e.g., the strength of the SE coupling, it would provide an alternative to the usual perturbative approaches to approximate dynamics.

Finally, since the memory kernel contains information about the SE generator, its operational reconstruction will allow for the extraction of information about the underlying dynamics. That is, the scheme presented here could be used to probe an unknown environment by observing the dynamics of the system alone, in a way that is complementary to Refs. [21–23]. In fact, the full set of intermediate dynamical maps constitutes the maximum possible amount of dynamical information imprinted on the system without considering higher order multitime correlations. The latter we will consider in a similar context in subsequent work.

Acknowledgments—The authors would like to thank Jared Cole, Guy Cohen, and Cesar Rodriguez-Rosario for stimulating discussions regarding this work. KM is supported through ARC FT160100073.

* felix.pollock@monash.edu
† kavan.modi@monash.edu

[1] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, J. Mod. Opt. **44**, 2455 (1997).
[2] K. Modi, Sci. Rep. **2**, 581 (2012).
[3] F. A. Pollock, C. Rodríguez-Rosario, T. Frauenheim, M. Paternostro, and K. Modi, arXiv:1512.00589 (2015).
[4] S. Milz, F. A. Pollock, and K. Modi, arXiv:1610.02152 (2016).
[5] H. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
[6] A. Fruchtman, N. Lambert, and E. M. Gauger, Sci. Rep. **6**, 28204 (2016).
[7] J. Iles-Smith, A. G. Dijkstra, N. Lambert, and A. Nazir, J. Chem. Phys. **144**, 044110 (2016).
[8] Y. Tanimura, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **75**, 082001 (2006).
[9] J. Strümpfer and K. Schulten, J. Chem. Theory Comput. **8**, 2808 (2012).
[10] A. W. Chin, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, in *Semiconductors and Semimetals, Vol. 85*, edited by U. Würfel, M. Thorwart, and E. R. Weber (Elsevier, 2011) pp. 115 – 143.
[11] N. Makri and D. E. Makarov, J. Chem. Phys. **102**, 4611 (1995).
[12] J. Cerrillo and J. Cao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 110401 (2014).
[13] P. Nalbach, A. Ishizaki, G. R. Fleming, and M. Thorwart, New J. Phys. **13**, 063040 (2011).
[14] Superoperator $\mathcal{U}_{t:t_0}^{SE}$ need not be unitary in general; however, it must be divisible.
[15] That is, $\mathcal{L}_t^{SE}\rho_t^{SE} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H_t^{SE}, \rho_t^{SE}]$, where H_t^{SE} is the SE Hamiltonian.
[16] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).
[17] V. Gorini, A. Kossakokowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, J. Math. Phys **17**, 821 (1976).
[18] Throughout this Letter we denote operators and superoperators acting on the system-environment space with superscript SE. We do not put a superscript on operators and superoperators acting on the system alone.
[19] K. Modi, Open Systems & Information Dynamics **18**, 253 (2011).
[20] M. Ringbauer, C. J. Wood, K. Modi, A. Gilchrist, A. G. White, and A. Fedrizzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 090402 (2015).
[21] J. Jeske, J. H. Cole, C. Müller, M. Marthaler, and G. Schön, New J. Phys. **14**, 023013 (2012).
[22] L. M. Norris, G. A. Paz-Silva, and L. Viola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 150503 (2016).
[23] F. A. Pollock, A. Chęcińska, S. Pascazio, and K. Modi, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 032112 (2016).
[24] R. Rosenbach, J. Cerrillo, S. F. Huelga, J. Cao, and M. B. Plenio, New J. Phys. **18**, 023035 (2016).

[25] S. M. Barnett and S. Stenholm, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 033808 (2001).
[26] S. Daffer, K. Wódkiewicz, J. D. Cresser, and J. K. McIver, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 010304 (2004).
[27] H.-P. Breuer and B. Vacchini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 140402 (2008).
[28] D. Chruściński and A. Kossakowski, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 020103 (2016).
[29] B. Vacchini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 230401 (2016).
[30] C. R. Willis and R. H. Picard, Phys. Rev. A **9**, 1343 (1974).
[31] R. H. Picard and C. R. Willis, Phys. Rev. A **16**, 1625 (1977).
[32] If (i) holds, then a combination of $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}$ and $\Lambda_{t:t_0}$ (operationally characterised by discarding and re-preparing the system at t_0) *is* enough to determine the full dynamics for initially correlated systems.
[33] Equidistance between time steps is not necessary for our derivation and is only chosen for convenience. It may be that other choices lead to faster convergence in practice.
[34] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2417 (1999).
[35] P. Facchi and S. Pascazio, J. Phys. A **41**, 493001 (2008).
[36] Since, in this case, $\Lambda_{t:s}\rho_s = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\mathcal{L}_s^{SE}\rho_s \otimes \rho^E\}$ will have some time-translation symmetry at long enough times.
[37] P.-Y. Yang and W.-M. Zhang, arXiv:1605.08521 (2016).
[38] S. Kitajima, M. Ban, and F. Shibata, J. Phys. A **50**, 125303 (2017).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Expanding transfer tensors in terms of system-environment projection superoperators

In order to reduce notational clutter, we leave out the explicit SE label on superoperators $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{L}$ in this section. Since we are assuming underlying dynamics such that $\Lambda_{t:s}\rho = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\mathcal{U}_{t:s}\rho \otimes \rho_s^E\}$, we can write the transfer tensors in terms of system-environment quantities; the action of the superoperator in Eq. (8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} T_{t:t_j}^{(N-j)}\rho =& \mathrm{tr}_E\Bigg\{\mathcal{U}_{t:t_j}\rho\otimes\tau_{t_j} - \sum_{k=j+1}^{N-1}\mathcal{U}_{t:t_k}\mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{U}_{t_k:t_j}\rho\otimes\tau_{t_j}\right\}\otimes\tau_{t_k} \\ &+ \sum_{k=j+2}^{N-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{k-1}\mathcal{U}_{t:t_k}\mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{U}_{t_k:t_l}\mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{U}_{t_l:t_j}\rho\otimes\tau_{t_j}\right\}\otimes\tau_{t_l}\right\}\otimes\tau_{t_k} - \dots\Bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This can be simplified by introducing the time-dependent projection superoperators $\mathcal{P}_t$ and $\mathcal{Q}_t = \mathcal{I}^{SE} - \mathcal{P}_t$, defined by the action $\mathcal{P}_t X = \mathrm{tr}_E X \otimes \tau_t$. In terms of these, the transfer tensor acting on the system is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{t:t_j}^{(N-j)}\rho =& \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{U}_{t:t_j}\mathcal{P}_{t_j}\rho^{SE} - \sum_{k=j+1}^{N-1}\mathcal{U}_{t:t_k}\mathcal{P}_{t_k}\mathcal{U}_{t_k:t_j}\mathcal{P}_{t_j}\rho^{SE} + \sum_{k=j+2}^{N-1}\sum_{l=j+1}^{k-1}\mathcal{U}_{t:t_k}\mathcal{P}_{t_k}\mathcal{U}_{t_k:t_l}\mathcal{P}_{t_l}\mathcal{U}_{t_l:t_j}\mathcal{P}_{t_j}\rho^{SE} - \dots\right\} \\ =& \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{U}_{t:t_{N-1}}\mathcal{Q}_{t_{N-1}}\mathcal{U}_{t_{N-1}:t_{N-2}}\mathcal{Q}_{t_{N-2}}\dots\mathcal{Q}_{t_{j+1}}\mathcal{U}_{t_{j+1}:t_j}\mathcal{P}_{t_j}\rho^{SE}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where ρ^{SE} is any state satisfying $\mathrm{tr}_E\{\rho^{SE}\} = \rho$. Noting that $\mathcal{M}_{t:t_0}[\mathcal{A}] = \mathrm{tr}_E\{\mathcal{U}_{t:t_0}\mathcal{A}\rho_{t_0}^{SE}\}$, a similar expansion for the inhomogeneous term leads to

$$\Xi_{t:t_0} = \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{U}_{t:t_{N-1}}\mathcal{Q}_{t_{N-1}}\mathcal{U}_{t_{N-1}:t_{N-2}}\mathcal{Q}_{t_{N-2}}\dots\mathcal{Q}_{t_1}\mathcal{U}_{t_1:t_0}\mathcal{Q}_{t_0}\mathcal{A}\rho_{t_0}^{SE}\right\}. \tag{15}$$

In the limit considered in the main text, where $t_{j+1} - t_j = \delta t := (t-t_0)/N$ and N is very large, the time evolution operator between two adjacent time points can be expanded in powers of δt as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{t_{j+1}:t_j} =& T_{\leftarrow}\exp\left[\int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}}\mathrm{d}s\,\mathcal{L}_s\right] = \mathcal{I} + \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}}\mathrm{d}s\,\mathcal{L}_s + \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}}\mathrm{d}s\int_{t_j}^{s}\mathrm{d}s'\,\mathcal{L}_s\mathcal{L}_{s'} + \dots \\ \simeq& \mathcal{I} + \delta t\mathcal{L}_{t_j} + \frac{1}{2}\delta t^2\mathcal{L}_{t_j}^2 + \dots. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Substituting this into Eq. (14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{t:t_j}^{(N-j)}\rho \simeq& \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{P}_t(\mathcal{I}+\delta t\mathcal{L}_{t_{N-1}}+\dots)\mathcal{Q}_{t_{N-1}}(\mathcal{I}+\delta t\mathcal{L}_{t_{N-2}}+\dots)\mathcal{Q}_{t_{N-2}}\dots\mathcal{Q}_{t_{j+1}}(\mathcal{I}+\delta t\mathcal{L}_{t_j}+\dots)\mathcal{P}_{t_j}\rho^{SE}\right\} \\ =& \delta t^2\mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{L}_{t_{N-1}}\left(\mathcal{I} + \delta t\sum_{k=j+1}^{N-2}\mathcal{Q}_{t_k}\mathcal{L}_{t_k} + \delta t^2\sum_{k=j+2}^{N-2}\sum_{l=j+1}^{k-1}\mathcal{Q}_{t_k}\mathcal{L}_{t_k}\mathcal{Q}_{t_l}\mathcal{L}_{t_l} + \dots\right)\mathcal{Q}_{t_{j+1}}\mathcal{L}_{t_j}\mathcal{P}_{t_j}\rho^{SE}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where we have used the fact that $\mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{Q}_s = \mathcal{Q}_t\mathcal{P}_s = 0$ and $\mathcal{Q}_t\mathcal{Q}_s = \mathcal{Q}_s$. In the limit that $N \to \infty$, $\delta t \to 0$ and the terms inside the central brackets resum to a time-ordered exponential:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} T^{(N-j)}_{t:t_j}\rho = \delta t^2 \,\mathrm{tr}_E \left\{ \mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{L}_t T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left[\int_{t_j}^{t} \mathrm{d}s\, \mathcal{Q}_s\mathcal{L}_s\right] \mathcal{Q}_{t_j}\mathcal{L}_{t_j}\mathcal{P}_{t_j}\rho^{SE} \right\} = \delta t^2 \mathcal{K}_{t:t_j}. \tag{18}$$

Again, the same procedure can be performed for the inhomogeneous term in Eq. (15), leading to

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \Xi_{t:t_0} = \delta t \,\mathrm{tr}_E \left\{ \mathcal{P}_t\mathcal{L}_t T_{\leftarrow} \exp\left[\int_{t_j}^{t} \mathrm{d}s\, \mathcal{Q}_s\mathcal{L}_s\right] \mathcal{Q}_{t_0}\mathcal{A}\rho^{SE}_{t_0} \right\} = \delta t \mathcal{J}_{t:t_0}. \tag{19}$$